Nixon's Tricky SALT Announcement, P. 2

They All Treated Dissent As Subversive and Criminal

Unity carried to unreasonable extremes can destroy a country. The Kaiser achieved unity in Germany. Hitler again achieved the same unity at the cost of freedom many years later. Mussolini achieved unity in Italy. The leaders of Japan through a method of so-called thought control achieved unity in Japan. In every case policies adopted by these enforcers of unity led to the destruction of their own country . . . Today it is just as easy for us to adopt a false foreign policy leading to the destruction of our people . . . The best safeguard against fatal error lies in continuous criticism and discussion.—*Senator Taft protesting in 1951 against the first commitment of U.S. troops to NATO without Congressional approval. Quoted by Fulbright to the Senate May 19 in debate on the Mansfield troop cut amendment.*

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XIX, No. 11 MAY 31, 1971 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Lyndon's Barbecue and the Mansfield Amendment

There is another Texas, and we are indebted to it for an irreverent view of that huge monument Lyndon Johnson has built himself in Austin. During the two May days when 10,000 people were arrested here commemorating another LBJ memorial, the Vietnam war, Mrs. Johnson gave the press a preview. One of those invited was Molly Ivins, co-editor of the always impious *Texas Observer*. Her tart and hilarious description appears in its May 21 issue. "When he dies," was one whispered comment after a trip through the windowless Pyramid-like mausoleum-library, "they'll put him inside and seal it and let Lady Bird throw herself in a pyre on top." For visitors who don't want to read a lot of musty old documents there are mannequins of Luci and Lynda wearing their *original* wedding dresses and a miniature theatre in which they can see films of LBJ's Finest Hours. There is even a large reproduction of the first bulletin Johnson received on the Tonkin Gulf. Miss Ivins suggests "a display of Great Moments that got left out"—

> **The campaign when the dead folks voted in alphabetical order . . . the scar, the beagles' ears . . . the day we invaded the Dominican Republic, those winning TV performances when he looked like a stomach with eyes and told us to pray, Abe Fortas, Bobby Baker and other ethical people, "we will not send American boys" and other great promises . . .** *

We half expect that Lyndon will match those other modern necrophiliac Pharaohs and arrange to have his body put on permanent exhibition in it like Lenin in Moscow. A modest charge to see the First Embalmed President could go to a foundation for needy oil men who had run through their depletion allowances.

Two Parties But Siamese Twins

Some future Gibbon may observe that as American imperialism ebbed, it was fitting that one of its Presidents should behave with the gargantuan ostentation of a late Roman Emperor. The mammoth barbecue with which the Library was dedicated, and the clan who gathered for it, can—like the fight on the Mansfield amendment a few days earlier—tell us a lot about the present state of the Union. For in both we could see the old Imperial Establishment close ranks; the two party system became one when the continuance of the Pax Americana was in danger. Here were old antagonists gathered—Goldwater and Nixon with Johnson in a good-fellowship possible only for those who disagree merely on secondary issues and the possession of office. Here were the familiar hangers-on of the American imperial court, the ex-idealists turned lobbyists and lawyer-servants, the fixers and the flatterers who raise campaign funds from their corporate masters for either party. In so joyous a burst of bi-partisanship none felt more at home. Here was Nixon hailing Johnson (and by implication praising himself) in saying that the times required Presidents who put principle above party. "Principle" was shorthand for the Vietnam war to which they were equally dedicated, for a NATO which maintains the American empire over Western Europe, for that Johnson Doctrine which became a Nixon Doctrine for extending a Monroe Doctrine over East Asia, and for the far-flung forces required to police the world's air and seas and more than half its land mass.

Here was Johnson expressing the liberal mythology of U.S. imperialism when he said his Library records "the time when liberty was challenged in Europe and Latin America and Asia" and "America's responses to those challenges." Liberty? Bosch deposed in Santo Domingo? Cuba driven into Stalinism by U.S. blockade? Brazil under its military torturers? Greece pushed into Fascism? Franco with a U.S. crutch for his decayed old age? Barely disguised police states under our patronage in South Korea, Taiwan, South Vietnam, Thailand and the Philippines?

And there, in the happy crowd at the barbecue, as in the vote on the Mansfield amendment, one could see those like

(Continued on Page Four)

The Fib That Sold The Senate on NATO

Sen. HICKENLOOPER: I believe you said earlier in your testimony today that it was contemplated that a great portion of the armament, or the developed armament, of Western Europe, in the nations of this pact would be carried under their own weight. I presume that refers also to the manpower in their armies. I am interested in getting the answers as to whether or not we are expected to supply substantial numbers . . . of troops and troop organizations, of American troops, to implement the land power of Western Europe prior to aggression. Is that contemplated under Article 3, where we agree to maintain and develop the collective capacity to resist? In other words, are we going to be expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of these countries' capacity to resist?

Secretary of State ACHESON: The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute "No".

—*From the original hearing on NATO before Senate Foreign Relations April 27, 1949. Page 47.*

* **The Texas Observer's address is 504 W. 24th St., Austin, Tex. 78705. It is 25 cents and $7 a year. We recommend it.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON SALT: Nixon's Exaggerated Claims Make Circumspection Advisable

THE FIRST THING TO BE SAID about the President's new announcement on the SALT talks is that no one here in Washington among all the experts knows what it really means. The second is that the first practical effect will be to stymie opposition in Congress to the new military budget. This provides $7.6 billion in new obligational authority for strategic weapons systems, including more MIRVs, more ABMs, a new bomber, a new long-distance nuclear submarine and a new airborne warning and control system (AWACS). The budget also provides $900 million more for research and development of future weaponry. These will be defended as "bargaining chips" and a new wave of optimism about SALT will make it difficult to cut them. Any proposed cuts will be termed "unilateral disarmament." *Thus the SALT talks continue to serve as a cover for an intensified arms race.* Arms control negotiations have become the Pentagon's chief weapon in disarming—the movement against the arms race.

Millennium Just Around The Corner

Nixon's own gloss on the astringent and ambiguous joint communique ended by saying that if successful his "major breakthrough" would open "a new era" in which "all nations will devote more of their energies and their resources, not to weapons of war, but to the works of peace." This is superinflation. There is no sign here whatsoever, even at the best, of more than a readiness to negotiate a numerical limit on strategic weapons while a qualitative strategic arms race goes on. Work on a new bomber, a new submarine and a better MIRV would continue. In the meantime any savings would be transferred to an upgrading of conventional arms in which the Pentagon feels that it is lagging.

The announcement would have been less suspect if couched with more restraint. There was a deadlock at SALT over the agenda, i.e. what to begin negotiating after 18 months of preliminary "discussion." A compromise was reached. The U.S. gave in and agreed to "concentrate" on an ABM agreement while the Soviets gave in and agreed to negotiate "certain measures" limiting offensive arms as well. This was a bit of progress in these glacially slow talks, but unless secret understandings have already been reached, this is only the beginning of a long and complex wrangle.

The big question is this: if both sides agree to limit their respective ABMs, what do we offer to limit in the field of offensive arms in return for a Soviet agreement to limit their SS-9s, which the Pentagon has built up as the bugaboo? An Administration spokesman warned at the White House briefing that any attempt at a general limit on offensive arms would come up against the problem which has been the main stumbling block—the "forward based systems." We have 7,000 "forward based" nuclear weapons in Western Europe and on our naval ships in its waters. These can blast Soviet cities and bases as surely as our more distant weapons. They want these counted as "strategic". We call them "tactical" and would exclude them from the SALT talks. It is as if the Soviets had nuclear weapons in Cuba or the Caribbean but insisted that they were only "tactical."

An ABM agreement would put a brake on the arms race. It is easier to negotiate than one on offensive arms. It would maintain the insane balance-of-terror for a little while longer. If this is what Nixon is heading for, with a little face-saver on offensive arms, we're all for it. But it's the ballyhoo—and the effect on the coming defense budget debate in Congress—that make us circumspect.

Bomb China By The Same Logic?

Sen. CHURCH: The American participation in the invasion of Cambodia and Laos was done on the theory that the President had the right to send our troops into those countries to make war in order to protect our troops in South Vietnam, that it was necessary to interdict the supply routes that constituted a threat to our troops. The same argument could be made for an American aerial bombardment of the supply lines that China uses to send war material into North Vietnam. Do you believe the President has constitutional authority to commence the bombing of these routes without first securing the consent of Congress?

Sec'y ROGERS: Well, there again, I would want to know a lot more about the situation before I answered it hypothetically. I think under those conditions which you have outlined, clearly we would come to Congress and present the facts. Now —

Sen. CHURCH: But you did not come to Congress in the case of Laos and Cambodia.

Sec'y ROGERS: No, and we went all over this.

Sen. CHURCH: Is this because China is a big country and Cambodia and Laos are small countries?

Sec'y ROGERS: No, it is quite different. China is not used as a sanctuary area.

—Before Senate Foreign Relations May 14 (abr)

On The Folly of Sending Congressmen To "Observe" Saigon's Rigged Elections

Chairman Fulbright. One of the bills proposes, Mr. Stevenson's, that we send a Congressional delegation, to well, observe the elections. What do you think about that?

Don Luce. I am opposed to it. Fulbright. Why?

Luce. To begin with, I do not believe that the elections this fall in Vietnam can be meaningful. The candidates cannot speak out about the major issues of the times. They cannot, for example, speak about a coalition government. Truong Dinh Dzu, who was the runner-up in the 1967 elections has been in jail since 1968 for just proposing talks with the NLF. As I mentioned before there are a hundred thousand political prisoners. These prisoners cannot participate in the election . . .

Fulbright. Were you there when the Congressional delegation was there observing the last election?

Luce. Yes, I was.

Fulbright. What effect did they have on the election?

Luce. I think the first thing which they did, the worst thing, was that they legitimized an election that the Vietnamese did not believe in . . . —for example, the elections committee in the constituent assembly voted something like 16 to 2 against validating the election.

Fulbright. What I am talking about is the role of American Congressmen, are they equipped and capable of insuring a fair election?

Luce. I don't think they did anything and I don't believe they can do very much . . . A comment from a Vietnamese friend of mine was this. He said, "Well, in your 1968, in your elections, we are going to send 22 Vietnamese who don't speak English to the United States for four days to see if your elections are fair," and this is what we did. We sent 22 Americans who didn't speak Vietnamese to Vietnam for four days and they came back and said the elections were fair.

—Don Luce May 13 before Senate Foreign Relations. Luce first went to South Vietnam in 1959 as a volunteer in agriculture. It was he who led visiting Congressmen to the "tiger cage" prisons of Con Son last year. The Saigon government expelled him on May 9 in retaliation for his independence as an investigator and free lance journalist.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Campaign of "Harassment and Interdiction" Against The Peace Movement

THE GOVERNMENT IS MOVING from the policy of mass arrest of demonstrators to mass harassment of the peace movement. The strategy is to tie up leaders and funds in a multiplicity of actions without worrying much about evidence, legality or the ultimate outcome. The tactics recall the indiscriminate "harassment and interdiction" tactics notorious in Vietnam, where the U.S. military doesn't care how many villagers are hurt so long as a few guerrillas may be hit. These cynical tactics are effective up to a point, the point where the overkill swells the ranks of those the government is trying to crush. The negative effects are already apparent here in the District of Columbia where passersby were swept up by the police, and many radicalized by their experience. A revealing statistic is that of the first 2,000 May Day arrest cases processed in the D.C. Superior Court, the vast majority were found not guilty or had the charges against them dropped. *Of those who contested the charges against them only four were found guilty.*

Conspiracy—On the Platform and TV!

Of the May Day leadership, Rennie Davis and John Froines have been arrested for conspiracy, though no evidence of illegal plotting or planning was adduced at their preliminary hearing, only public statements. It is a strange conspiracy which is carried on in the open and on TV. Bradford Lyttle, a lifelong pacifist and a gentle creature, has been arrested on the preposterous charge of assaulting a policeman; he claims he was grabbed by the police from behind outside the Justice Department and did no more than drop his bullhorn. Significantly this is an escalation from the original charge of disorderly conduct and prosecution has been taken over from the District U.S. Attorney by the Internal Security division of Justice. A special grand jury was about to be convened when we went to press and will no doubt be used, Harrisburg and Seattle style, to put all sorts of people through the wringer in an effort to elicit testimony under the threat of contempt.

The House Internal Security Committee has also swung into action. Its first defeat came when a Federal Judge, on appeal from the National Peace Action Coalition, ruled that the committee may no longer seize its bank records without giving it notice and an opportunity to challenge the legality of the subpoena. A similar preliminary ruling was made against Senate Internal Security last month in a suit by the Progressive Labor Party. These committees not only have access by Presidential order to income tax records but are the only agencies of government that subpoena bank records without notice to the owners. This is a curious way to manifest their devotion to private property. The House Committee (by reading the Trotzkyist *Militant* and the Communist *Daily World*) discovered some well-known Trotzkyists in the leadership of the Peace Coalition and some well-known Communists in that of the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice. Neither fact is a secret, and we believe the country is too sophisticated, too bored with the Red menace and too hostile to the Vietnam war to be impressed by this replay of McCarthyism. We think the attempted smear will boomerang.

An 18-year-old testified that Fred Halstead, who was the Socialist Workers (Trotzkyist) candidate for President in 1968, seemed to be in charge of the NPAC office because "he had the key to the Coke machine." The revelation may cost Halstead the nomination in 1972. The witness who turned him in said he had spent three nights at the NPAC office stuffing envelopes to find out what was going on for the Freedom Leadership Foundation, a subsidiary of the Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity started by a Korean anti-Communist *guru*. His ecstatic followers live in communes and hold an annual mass marriage in Seoul. Sitting on the Committee, vigilant and militant, was the Birchite Congressman Schmitz of California. When a Birchite can use a Committee of Congress to expose Trotzkyites, U.S. politics need a psychiatrist.

Double Gee Whiz Dept.

The House Internal Security Committee, on an announced hunt for evidence that the recent anti-war demonstrations here were Communist inspired, was told that the Washington Monument was in danger of being destroyed by the peace demonstrators. At least that is the theory of Russell Dickenson, director of National Capitol Parks, who testified yesterday. That is why 40 U.S. park policemen spent much of the night of the April 24 demonstration inside the monument while thousands listened to rock music on the grounds outside. "Otherwise we might not have had the Washington Monument," said Mr. Dickenson to a surprised committee.—*Washington Daily News May 19*

And that's a committee ordinarily ready to believe anything.

Twelve Members of Congress Assail HUAC/HISC Campaign to Smear The Peace Movement

Only three weeks ago—during a debate in the House over funds for the House Internal Security Committee (HISC)—we cautioned our colleagues that continued funding of this committee could only result in continued harrassment of those individuals and groups involved in activities of which the committee does not approve. Our warnings were ignored, the committee received more money than ever before and HISC—in what appears to be an attempt to discredit the peace movement in this country—is beginning hearings on organizations that have sponsored anti-war demonstrations here in Washington over the last month.

Once again HISC has determined to ignore the First Amendment rights of every citizen of this country and will attempt to intimidate those who would exercise their rights to peacefully protest a policy of this government.

However, if HISC is to disparage the entire anti-war movement, it will have to take on an overwhelming majority of the people in this country. Anti-war sentiment is not restricted to a few dissenting groups or individuals at this point in time; it is shared by over 73 percent of the public, a percentage that is constantly growing. HISC cannot attack or single out any individual anti-war group at this time without impugning the integrity of millions of Americans who are opposed to our involvement in Southeast Asia. By initiating another witch hunt, HISC is actually questioning the integrity of a majority of Americans who desire peace, who abhor killing and senseless destruction, who long for the day when billions of dollars now spent on bullets and guns can be used to revitalize our decaying cities, to improve our schools, and to provide health care and a decent home for every American.

In this context HISC is guilty of what we would term the ultimate un-American activity and we call on all Americans to join with us in expressing abhorrence of this latest and most outrageous action of this committee.

—Statement issued May 18 by Democratic Congressmen Burton (Cal), Conyers (Mich), Edwards (Cal), Fraser (Minn), Harrington (Mass), Koch (NY), Helstoski (NJ), Kastenmeier (Wisc), Mikva (Ill), Rosenthal (NY) and Ryan (NY). They were joined by Bella Abzug (NY).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nixon's Credibility Gap Now Slightly Larger Even Than LBJ's

(Continued From Page One)

Muskie and Humphrey who are prepared, albeit after some tactical retreat in South Vietnam, to carry on the Pax Americana with all that entails. When someone told Humphrey at the barbecue that the crowd seemed like "the government in exile" he replied (*Washington Post* May 23), "Oh, no. This is a government in preparation. You've heard of recycling haven't you?" There was more truth in the jest than in a dozen prepared speeches. Recycling the leftovers of the Johnson regime, particularly this political Beagle whose ears LBJ had twisted irreparably out of shape, for re-use. If the bi-partisan Imperial Establishment has its way, we can see here the shape of the next election, shaped so that the military-industrial complex can stay in business no matter who wins.

Still Drafting Jesus

The spectacle was ripe for a new Satyricon. There was the Rev. Billy Graham between barbecue munches giving an interview on revitalizing the Christian spirit, perhaps in time for some more Mylais in Asia. There was Lyndon embracing that overgrown Boy Scout, Gen. Westmoreland and giving him absolution for Johnson's military mistakes. Kept at a distance were 500 anti-war demonstrators, among them Vietnam veterans who threw their medals over the police lines while Elizabeth Carpenter, once Mrs. Johnson's press secretary, shouted at the demonstrators, "Who do you think you're picketing anyhow? The people in there are people who fought for things you believe in—civil rights and education." The plea was pathetic in its inability to understand the revulsion of the young against the evils this superficial and opportunist liberalism masked, or the swelling loss of public confidence generally. A new Gallup poll shows that Nixon's credibility gap is about the same as Johnson's at a comparable point in the latter's Presidency—67% disbelieve Nixon as 65% disbelieved Johnson but both go on as if nothing had happened. Among the displays of supposedly memorable campaign statements Johnson showed Nixon in his tour of the Library was the latter's "I believe in the American dream." What dream? The dream is becoming a nightmare of rotting cities, growing race revolt and a decline of the once almighty dollar as we continue to squander on our overgrown military establishment abroad the billions we need for reconstruction at home.

Behind the frustrated debate on the Mansfield amendment to cut our NATO troops in half were the interrelated issues of spending priorities, of imperialism and of a Presidential power which has escaped Congressional control. The barbecue was a celebration of the joint victory won by the dominant forces in both parties in resisting change on all three fronts. The victory is precarious. As on Vietnam, there must be some tactical retreat to hold the line. But a little give here and there will not do the job. Without a giant and radical reordering of priorities, the American dream will end in tragedy. The old bipartisan leadership menaces our country's future.

Speaking of Precipitate Action

Sen. SYMINGTON: In the debate on the Mansfield amendment which I fully support, the word "precipitate" has been used [as if] we were rushing into something. For five long years I have been one of those who supported efforts to achieve a substantial reduction of the American forces in Europe. On October 26, 1963, President Eisenhower in an article said: "Though for eight years in the White House I believed and announced to my associates that a reduction of American strength in Europe should be initiated as soon as the European economy was restored, the matter was then considered too delicate a political question to raise. I believe the time has now come when we should start withdrawing some of these troops. One American division in Europe can 'show the flag" as definitely as can several." Do you agree?

Sec'y ROGERS: Well, I do not like to disagree with President Eisenhower, but—no, I, we, if you would like to discuss the Mansfield Resolution I can. We are very much opposed to it, Senator, for a lot of reasons.

Sen. SYMINGTON: Senator Mansfield only wants to take out half as many as President Eisenhower suggested eight years ago. Do you even disagree with that?

Sec'y ROGERS: I think that the passage of this bill at this time would be a very serious mistake.

—Before Senate Foreign Relations May 14 (abr)

We'll Send A Free Sample Copy Of This Issue To A Friend If You Send Us A Long, Stamped, Self Addressed Envelope

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed special pre-publication price of $8.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, **Polemics and Prophecies: 1967-70** (Random House). Regularly $10.

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew ☐ **or enter** ☐ **a sub for the enclosed $5:**

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 5/31/71

4420 29th St. N. W., Washington, D. C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly
4420 29th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly. 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED